Manazemen

for the State of Montana and Yellowstone National Park

RESPONSES TO COMMENTS

ON THE DRAFT ENVIRONMENTAL

IMPACT STATEMENT



VOLUME TWO

Responses to Substantive Comments on the Draft Environmental Impact Statement

Purpose and Methodology

The final environmental impact statement is to be an accurate analysis of impacts of the proposed action and its alternatives. Public and agency review of the draft statement helps to ensure quality.

On June 16, 1998, the Draft Environmental Impact Statement for the Interagency Bison Management Plan for the State of Montana and Yellowstone National Park was released for public review in a formal 120-day comment period. The U.S. Department of the Interior, National Park Service, and the U.S. Department of Agriculture, Forest Service, are the federal lead agencies. The U.S. Department of Agriculture, Animal and Plant Health Inspection Service (APHIS), is a cooperating agency. The state of Montana was also a lead agency when the Draft Environmental Impact Statement was released to the public; however, the state's status has changed, and they are no longer participating in this capacity (see volume 1, appendix C). Following requests from the public for more time to review the Draft Environmental Impact Statement, the agencies extended the comment period until November 3, 1998.

The Draft Environmental Impact Statement examined seven alternatives as a means of minimizing the risk of transmitting the disease brucellosis from bison to domestic cattle on public and private lands adjacent to Yellowstone National Park. The comment period generated 67,520 documents from the public, which contained 212,249 individual comments. Comments were received by letter, electronic mail, and verbally at a series of public hearings held in 13 cities across the United States.

Approximately 64,000 responses were submitted by individuals, 2,400 by organizations, 700 by tribes and tribal organizations, and the remainder by businesses, public agencies, and congressional representatives. Comments were received from every state and 48 countries.

Of those comments responding to the range of alternatives presented in the *Draft Environmental Impact Statement*, alternative 7 (the draft preferred alternative) received the greatest number (over 25,000) expressing concern about its proposed bison management actions. Of those commenting on the other draft alternatives, more concern than support was expressed by the public. There was overwhelming support for a "Citizens' Plan" alternative (over 45,000 comments), followed by a "Bison Alternative." Both alternatives, as well as others submitted during the comment period, are addressed in volume 1, "The Alternatives." These issues are summarized in a report entitled, "Content Analysis of Public Comment for the Interagency Bison Management Plan for the State of Montana and Yellowstone National Park" (Greystone Environmental Consultants 1999).

At the close of the comment period, the agencies began a content analysis of public responses to the *Draft Environmental Impact Statement*. Every document was read and sorted in terms of its subject matter and content. A number was assigned to each letter, electronic mail document, and verbal testimony given at public hearings. This number was used for tracking purposes and was entered into a database (the comment numbers are shown following the name of each responder in the "Index of Comment Letters by Category of Author"). As each document was read, codes were assigned to categorize the content, topic, and issue of each comment made in the letter. These codes were also entered into a data base for tracking purposes; they are shown in parentheses after the topic heading; for example, "Bison: Capture/Test/Slaughter Operations (BI-5)."

After each document was coded, a series of steps were taken to determine whether the individual comment was substantive or nonsubstantive, according to the criteria set forth in the Council on Environmental Quality regulations. Substantive comments are those that raise an issue regarding law or regulation, agency procedure or performance, compliance with stated objectives, validity of impact analyses, or other matters of practical or procedural importance. Nonsubstantive comments are those that offered opinions or provided information not

directly related to issues or impact analyses. Substantive comments require a response or a corresponding revision in the environmental impact statement text; nonsubstantive comments are used as background information for the EIS team, but do not require a formal response.

The purpose of reading, coding, and analyzing the contents of the comment letters was to assist the agencies in determining if the substantive issues raised by the public warranted further modification and study of alternatives, issues, and impacts. With the information provided through the review process, the agencies reconsidered the draft preferred alternative (alternative 7) and developed a "modified preferred alternative," as described in volume 1, "The Alternatives."

Organization of Comments and Responses

This volume contains a summary of the substantive comments received on the *Draft Environmental Impact Statement*, by topic and issue, and the agencies' responses to those comments. The topics are major headings, organized alphabetically, with subheadings reflecting the issues that were identified during the public comment period. These issues are further broken down into specific questions or concerns raised by the public. Substantive comments were addressed either in the comment and response section, the text of the environmental impact statement, or both places.

Volume 2 includes a table of contents of each topic and issue to aid the reader in locating a particular issue and the agencies' response. An "Index of Comments by Topic" is provided as well as an "Index of Comment Letters by Category of Author," organized by businesses; organization and educational institutions; federal, state, and local officials; and Native American tribes and tribal organizations.

A commenter will be able to find the response to a particular question by consulting the topic, issue, and subsequent question and answer. In some cases, summaries of the agencies' responses have been integrated into volume 1. Where applicable, changes to the environmental impact statement text are indicated in the response.

Volume 3 contains an index and copies of comment letters and portions of transcripts received from businesses; organizations; federal, state, and local officials; and Native American tribes and tribal organizations. Due to the number of individuals who commented on the *Draft Environmental Impact Statement*, their names have not been included in volume 3, but are available upon request.

Index of Comment Letters by Category of Author

Business Comment Letters

- Abrahams, Loewenstein, Bushman and Kauffman—3910. Alternatives: Citizens' Plan. Objectives and Constraints: Legal and Policy Mandates—Management Authority.
- Adventurer Tours 13442. Bison: Distribution (Live), Effects on Free-Ranging Status and Distribution, Brucellosis in Yellowstone Bison Herd, Brucellosis Transmission and Public Perception. Livestock Operations: Public Grazing Allotments Modify. Wildlife: Brucellosis in Other Wild Ungulates.
- All Aboard Travel 7561. Alternatives: Citizens' Plan. Bison: Effects on Free-Ranging Status and Distribution.
- Allen, Jack, Attorney at Law 11097. Bison:
 Distribution (Live), Hunting, Land
 Acquisitions/Easements or Winter Range.
 Socioeconomics: Reasonable Project Costs.
 Visitor Use: Winter Recreation.
- Alpine Environmental, Inc. 9079. Alternatives:
 Citizens' Plan. Bison: Capture/Test/Slaughter
 Operations, Distribution (Live), Effects on FreeRanging Status and Distribution, Land
 Acquisitions/Easements or Winter Range.
 Livestock Operations: Public Grazing
 Allotments Modify. Objectives and
 Constraints: Legal and Policy Mandates —
 Management Authority. Socioeconomics:
 Social Values. Visitor Use: Overall Visitor Use
 and Experience.
- Andersons Arsenal 2563. Alternatives: Citizens'
 Plan. Bison: Capture/Test/Slaughter Operations,
 Distribution (Live), Hunting, Population,
 Special Management Areas, Land Acquisitions/
 Easements or Winter Range. Livestock
 Operations: Public Grazing Allotments —
 Modify, Cattle Vaccination.
- Architectural Illustration 14368. Socioeconomics: Social Values. Visitor Use: Overall Visitor Use and Experience.
- Artistic Features Art Studio 6152. Bison: Capture/ Test/Slaughter Operations. Livestock Operations: Public Grazing Allotments — Modify.
- Aspen Trading Post 11902. Alternatives: Citizens' Plan. Bison: Effects on Free-Ranging Status and Distribution.
- Audio Press 14438. Alternatives: Citizens' Plan.
 Bison: Effects on Free-Ranging Status and
 Distribution. Objectives and Constraints: Legal

- and Policy Mandates Management Authority.
- Ayers Northwest 9056. Visitor Use: Winter Recreation.
- Ayurvedic Rehabilitation Center 753. Bison:
 Capture/Test/Slaughter Operations, Brucellosis
 Transmission and Public Perception. Livestock
 Operations: Public Grazing Allotments —
 Modify. Objectives and Constraints: Legal and
 Policy Mandates Management Authority.
 Visitor Use: Winter Recreation.
- Backyard Designs 1434. Alternatives: Citizens'
 Plan. Bison: Capture/Test/Slaughter Operations,
 Distribution (Live), Hunting, Population,
 Special Management Areas, Land Acquisitions/
 Easements or Winter Range. Livestock
 Operations: Public Grazing Allotments —
 Modify, Cattle Vaccination.
- Baker Animal Hospital 8926. Alternatives:
 Citizens' Plan. Bison: Distribution (Live),
 Effects on Free-Ranging Status and
 Distribution, Population, Special Management
 Areas, Land Acquisitions/Easements or Winter
 Range. Livestock Operations: Cattle
 Vaccination.
- Baldwin Realty 705. Bison: Effects on Free-Ranging Status and Distribution, Population, Land Acquisitions/Easements or Winter Range. Livestock Operations: Public Grazing Allotments — Modify.
- Blaise Hayward Studio 9413. Alternatives: Bison Alternative. Bison: Capture/Test/Slaughter Operations, Humane Treatment, Hunting, Quarantine Operations, Vaccination.
- Blue Water Publishing, Inc. 10530. Alternatives: Alternative Plan B. Bison: Capture/Test/ Slaughter Operations.
- Boesche, McDermott and Eskridge 6201.

 Alternatives: Citizens' Plan. Bison:
 Capture/Test/Slaughter Operations, Effects on Free-Ranging Status and Distribution, Humane Treatment. Socioeconomics: Social Values.
- Boocks Farm 16778. Bison: Capture/Test/
 Slaughter Operations, Effects on Free-Ranging
 Status and Distribution, Brucellosis
 Transmission and Public Perception.
 Socioeconomics: Cost to Livestock Operators.
- Bracer Consulting 13417. Alternatives: New Alternatives/Issues.

Index of Commenters by Topic

Alternatives

Adjustments to Interim Plan (AL-2)

Cheyenne River Sioux Tribe — 17759 Greater Yellowstone Coalition — 15420 Upper Sioux Community — 14701 Yankton Sioux Tribe — 15846

Alternative Plan B (AL-54)

15354

Alliance for the Wild Rockies - 8616 American Lands Alliance - 5373 American Reform Party - CA - 4354 Appalachian Voices. See Preserve Appalachian Wilderness -- 15372 Blue Water Publishing, Inc. - 10530 Buffalo Gap Land Rescue -- 14911 Buffalo Nations - 15187 Cold Mountain, Cold Rivers - 15366 Deerlodge Forest Defense Fund — 13055 Ecology Center - 15150, 15254, 15671 Edmonds Institute — 15517 **Environmental Protection Information Center — 14337** Friends of the Wild Swan - 15237 Heartwood. See Preserve Appalachian Wilderness — 15372 In Defense of Animals — 15193a LaCrosse Associates - 13033a Michigan Department of Agriculture - 10509 Montana Ecosystems Defense Council -15165, 9592 Montana State Senate - 15316 Montana Stockgrowers Association - 14939 Native Forest Network -- 4102 North Coast Environmental Center - 15326 Northern Rockies Preservation Project — 5064 Predator Education Fund — 14894 Predator Project -- 15332 Preserve Appalachian Wilderness — 15372. Republicans for Environmental Protection -14892 Richard Raymond Associates - 14688 Sierra Club, Upper Columbia River - 13036 Virginia 10th District Environmental Council -- 11398 Wild Rockies InfoNet - 15545 Wildlands Center for Preventing Roads -

Alternatives/Issues Eliminated from Further Consideration (AL-3)

Cheyenne River Sioux Tribe — 17751, 17755, 17758

Montana State Senate — 15316

Sisseton Wahpeton Sioux Tribe — 17713

New Alternatives/Issues (AL-4)

Alabama Farmers Federation — 9948
Alabama Veterinary Medical Association —
14607

American Indian Movement — 15261 American Lands Alliance — 3037 Animal Advocates of Lake County — 8750 Animal Rights Alliance. See Schubert & Associates — 10110

Appalachian Voices. See Preserve Appalachian Wilderness — 15372

Apple Country Snowmobile Club — 9255 Assiniboine Tribe — 14844, 17725, 17727, 17728, 17729, 17730

Audubon Society, Evergreen Naturalists — 15572

Blue Ribbon Coalition, Inc. — 7262
Bracer Consulting — 13417
Bruce Jackson Photography — 3795
California Dept of Food and Agriculture — 9243

California Federation for Animal Legislation — 4590

Cheyenne River Sioux Tribe — 17751, 17754, 17758, 17759

Cold Mountain, Cold Rivers — 15366 Colville Confederated Tribes — 6990 Committee to Abolish the Fur Trade. See

Schubert & Associates — 10110
Confederated Salish and Kootenai Tribes of the Flathead Nation — 17735

Ecology Center — 15671 Ethics Outreach — 8664

Farm Sanctuary. See Schubert & Associates — 10110

Florida Biodiversity Project — 9382 Fort Belknap Community Council — 15745 Georgia Farm Bureau Federation — 14398 Greater Yellowstone Coalition — 15420 Gros Ventre Tribe — 17732, 17733

Flandreau Santee Sioux Tribe - 194

Hagenbarth Livestock — 10638

Hakansson, Carl G., Attorney at Law — 1905 Heartwood. See Preserve Appalachian Wilderness — 15372

Humane Legislative Network — 6535 Humane Society, Golden State — 5948 Idaho Farm Bureau Federation — 11433

Contents

Alternatives

Adiustments to	lnterim Plan (AL-2)	3
Issue 1:		
Issue 2:		
Alternative Pla	an B (AL-54)	4
lssue 1:		
Alternatives/Is	sues Eliminated from Further Consideration (AL-3)	Q
lssue 1:		
Issue 2:	S .	
lssue 3:		
		1.1
	ves/Issues (AL-4)	11
Issue 1:		
Issue 2:	Scope of Analysis Cost-Effectiveness	
Issue 3:		
Issue 4: Issue 5:		
lssue 6: Issue 7:		
Issue 8:		
Issue 9:		
	: Completely New Alternatives	
	: Use of a Buffer Area	
	A Bison Refuge	
	Brucellosis Eradication in Yellowstone National Park vs. Other Areas	
	ve (AL-55)	30
Issue 1:		
Citizens' Plan (AL-53)	33
Issue 1:	The Citizens' Plan	
Bison		
O	and the Oracline (DLO)	45
	aughter Operations (BI-5)	43
Issue 1:	Testing Control Facilities	
Issue 2:	Capture Facilities	
Issue 3: Issue 4:	Cessation of All Capture, Test, and Slaughter Operations Capture, Test, and Slaughter Operations	
	Additional Analysis Needed or Inaccurate Analysis Presented	
Issue 5:		
	w Risk (BI-6)	52
	Federal vs. State Definition of Low Risk	
Issue 2:		
Issue 3:	Transmission by Certain Age/Sex Classes of Bison	
Issue 4:	Low-Risk Bison and Testing	
Issue 5:	Accept the Low-Risk Management Techniques of "Plan B"	
lssue 6:	Zero Tolerance or Zero Risk	
lssue 7:	Low-Risk Season	
Distribution (Ca	rcasses) (BI-7)	57
Issue 1:	Sale of Harvested Bison	
Issue 2:	Distribution of Bison Carcasses to Native American Tribes	

Adjustments to Interim Plan (AL-2)

1ssue 1: Include Specific Management Activities in Alternative 1 (Interim Plan)

A Comment: Quarantine should be added to alternative 1.

<u>Response</u>: Alternative 1 is the "no-action" alternative, i.e., the current *Interim Bison Management Plan*, and does not include a quarantine facility. However, alternative 4 in the environmental impact statement is very similar to alternative 1 except for the addition of a quarantine facility and hunting. The description of this alternative is located on pp. 84–89 of the *Draft Environmental Impact Statement*.

Representative Comment: 15543Al

Issue 2: Analysis of Alternative I is Incomplete

A <u>Comment</u>: Analysis of effects on the bison population in alternative 1 is incomplete because all bison are assumed to be captured and tested, and shooting untested bison in the west boundary area is not considered.

Response: In the unlikely event future conditions in the West Yellowstone, Montana area were similar to the 1996–97 winter, i.e., capture facilities were effective in capturing only 27% of the bison entering the west boundary area, and the agencies chose to shoot all remaining untested bison, approximately 16% of the bison entering the west boundary area might remain on public lands (see volume 1, "Appendix A: Evaluation of Adjustments to Interim Bison Management Plan, Winter 1997-1998 — Impacts of Adjustments to Bison Population"). Since the winter of 1996–97, the cooperating agencies have implemented adjustments to the interim plan with the intent to reduce the number of bison killed as part of management actions. Those adjustments have included hazing bison, constructing a second capture facility in the Horse Butte area, and a provision that untested low-risk bison (bulls, yearlings, calves, and females that have given birth) would not have to be shot in the west boundary area for Montana to maintain its class-free status. These provisions will likely increase the percentage of bison captured and decrease the percentage of untested bison that are shot such that the resulting impacts to the bison population will be similar to those presented in the analysis for alternative 1.

Representative Comment: 15420YI